



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ATTORNEY AND CLIENT—ASSOCIATE COUNSEL.—Where an attorney employed to perform certain services, associates another with him, he alone is responsible for the latter's compensation, even though his client knew that the latter was also performing the service. An instruction predicated upon such knowledge, and providing for a *quantum meruit* verdict for plaintiff, is held to be error. *McCarthy v. Crump* (Col.), 67 Pac. 343.

CHURCH COURTS—RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.—The civil courts have no power to interpose in controversies arising out of matters of faith and doctrine, but will review, and, if necessary, reverse the action of a church court not only where a property right (e. g., a minister's salary) is involved, but also where the only question is whether there has been a violation by the church court of the church law of procedure. *Wallace v. Trustees General Assembly* (Pa.) 50 Atl. 762.

LIFE INSURANCE—CHILD'S INTEREST IN PARENT'S LIFE.—The existence of a law imposing upon a son the duty of supporting his father in case the latter becomes unable to support himself, is held in *Life Insurance Clearing Co. v. O'Neil* (C. C. A. 3d C.), 54 L. R. A. 225, to give the son no insurable interest in the father's life, in the absence of any expenditures past or prospective, towards such support.

With this case is a note reviewing the authorities as to insurable interest in life of parent or child or other relative by blood.

OFFICIAL BONDS—LIABILITY OF SHERIFF FOR WRONGFUL ACT OF DEPUTY.—The killing by a deputy sheriff of a person under the mistaken belief that he is one for whose arrest on a charge of felony he has a warrant, and that the killing is necessary to prevent his escape, is held in *Johnson v. Williams* (Ky.), 54 L. R. A. 220, to render the sheriff liable on his bond, where the statute provides that he shall be liable on his bond for any misconduct or default of his deputies.

Cf. *Sangster v. Commonwealth*, 17 Gratt. 131; *Mosby v. Mosby*, 9 Gratt. 589.

CORPORATIONS—MINORITY STOCKHOLDERS—COUNSEL FEES.—Minority stockholders of a corporation, who, by filing an equitable petition against it and its officers, succeeded in enjoining it from doing *ultra vires* acts which would have required the expenditure of money, are held in *Alexander v. Atlanta & W. P. R. Co.* (Ga.), 54 L. R. A. 305, not to be entitled to a judgment for their attorneys' fees against the corporation, when the litigation did not result in the recovery of any property, and the corporation itself repudiated the efforts of the plaintiffs to thus protect its interests, and, in defense to their petition, contended that the acts in question were not *ultra vires*, but authorized by its charter.

MASTER AND SERVANT—VICE-PRINCIPAL.—A foreman authorized to purchase, inspect, and direct the use of lumber for the temporary structure of a bridge which his employer is engaged in constructing, is held in *Lafayette Bridge Co. v. Olsen* (C. C. A. 7th C.), 54 L. R. A. 33, to represent the master in respect to the duty of inspecting to ascertain if the lumber used is reasonably suitable for the